UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/716,622	11/20/2003	Akira Watanabe	Y2238.0054	6336	
32172 DICKSTEIN SI	7590 01/28/200 HAPIRO LLP	EXAMINER			
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS (6TH AVENUE) NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714			HOTELLING, HAROLD A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2164			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/28/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/716,622	WATANABE, AKIRA		
Examiner	Art Unit		
HAROLD A. HOTELLING	2164		

HAF	ROLD A. HOTELLING	2164	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (was for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1 periods:	ame day as filing a Notice of Ass: (1) an amendment, affidaviith appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisor no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). Of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	ry Action, or (2) the date set forth an SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on wh have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensio under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorte set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n and the corresponding amount oned statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but pr (a) They raise new issues that would require further conside (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better fo appeal; and/or	ration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a correspond NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			OTOL 224)
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. Sometimes 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable. 	<u>_</u> .		
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) whow the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ill not be entered, or b) 🔲 wil		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suff was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	icient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a No- entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overce showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	ome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but doe <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO) 		condition for allowand	ce because:
13. Other:	(SE) (SE) (10(S).		
/H. A. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 2164	/Vincent F. Boccio/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2169	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant appears to present two arguments that Kalpathy et al. (US 2002/0039365 A1) (assigned to Broadcom) (published on April 4, 2002) (hereafter "Kalpathy") does not teach the applicant's claimed (effective filing date: November 20, 2002) "SEARCHING THE FIRST SEARCH RESULTS OF SAID FIRST SEARCH PROCESSING MEANS WITH A SECOND SEARCH METHOD THAT IS DIFFERENT FROM SAID FIRST SEARCH METHOD."

The applicant argues firstly on pages 6 - 7: "while it is the Cache that is searched in Search Stage Zero, it is the 8K Table (not the results of Search Stage Zero) that is searched in Search Stage One. The two search steps disclosed in Kalpathy are clearly set forth in Fig. 5. In that figure, step 5 10 states 'Search Cache' while step 520 states 'Search Table Based on Search Results of Search in Cache.' Nothing could be clearer. The second search in Kalpathy uses the results of the first search (i.e., the search conducted at step 5 1 0), but utilizes those results to search the Table. Not only is there no teaching or suggestion that the results of the search conducted at step 5 10 are what is being searched in step 520, but Fig. 5 clearly and unambiguously shows that it is not the search results of step 510 that are being searched in step 520; it is the Table that is being searched."

Figure 5 in Kalpathy was not a basis for rejecting the applicant's claims.

The applicant argues secondly on page 7:

"In spite of the clear and explicit teaching in Kalpathy that the second stage searches the 8K table, and not the results of the search of his first stage, the Response to Arguments appeared to be arguing that Kalpathy second stage must in fact search the search results of the first search. In particular, the position is taken that because the second stage search in Kalpathy is based on the first stage search results, it must at some point "search" those search results.

"In the first place, there is no teaching in Kalpathy that any searching is done, in a second stage search, on the search results of the first stage. The Examiner's surmise that basing the second search on the results of the first search means that a search must be done on those results is simply unsupported by Kalpathy. The only search taught by Kalpathy done by Search Stage One is a search on the larger 8K table (in paragraph [0045] another example uses a 16K table). And of course, at least because there is no such search being done, there is no teaching or remote suggestion that a different method of search is used on the search results from that used in the first search, as in claim 1.

"Therefore, Kalpathy fails to disclose that the results of the first search are then searched again by a different search method, as required by the independent claims."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's belief that "there is no teaching in Kalpathy that any searching is done, in a second stage search, on the search results of the first stage."

The Kalpathy "Search Stage One" does access the 8K Table "based on" the results of the "Search Stage Zero" search of the Cache. Moreover, Kalpathy (paragraph [0059], last four lines) explains that "the invention is not limited to which entries in the table the Cache is made up of. For example, the Cache could be made up of entry 5, 256, 300 etc. until all entries in the Cache are filled."

In order to base the "Search Stage One" on the "Search Stage Zero" search results, the Kalpathy invention must LOOK OVER the "Search Stage Zero" search results TO FIND the entry on which to base "Search Stage One."

The definition of "search" archived on April 12, 2001 at:

http://web.archive.org/web/20010412051624/http://www.bartleby.com/61/32/S0193200.html

1. To make a thorough examination of; LOOK OVER carefully in order TO FIND something; explore.

Because the Kalpathy "Search Stage One" is "based on" the "Search Stage Zero" search results, the Kalpathy "Search Stage One" must SEARCH through the "Search Stage Zero" search results before basing any subsequent steps on the "Search Stage Zero" search results.

Therefore, Kalpathy does "disclose that the results of the first search are then SEARCHed again by a different search method . .